

**net.work.Maryland Advisory Group
Monthly Meeting
August 20, 2002 10:00 am – 2:20 pm
Southern Maryland Association of REALTORS
Hughesville, Maryland**

ADVISORY GROUP ATTENDEES:

Margo Burnette (Vice Chair)
Richard Aldridge
Walter Bigalow (Alt. for J.Wood)
Jeff Blank
Chuck Bristow
Mary Clapsaddle
Devon Dobson (ex-officio member)
Michael McCarty
Karen Millison (Alt. For R.Forsythe)

William Morrow
Susan Ockert (Alt. for L.Powell)
Lewis Powell
Stuart Ragland (Alt. For P.Wallace)
Richard Rose
Paul Thorn (Alt. For B.McGrory)
Renee Winsky
Judi Wood

DBM STAFF ATTENDEES:

Bill Dye
Jodey McGhee
Mary Ann Slack
Joe Scher

OTHER GOVERNMENT ATTENDEES:

Steve McHenry
Lora Bennett

Reported By:	Topic / Discussion	Action	Completion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written Opinion from PSC / FCC Equipment Orders Circuits Complete 	<p>discussion on net.work.Maryland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> December ANNOUNCEMENT: Technology Showcase. net.work.Maryland is on the agenda. Margo to verify logistics with Jamie. 	
M.McCarty	<p>Requirements Committee – Changes to June 2002 Requirements The review of the June “Requirements Document” by members of the Requirements Committee resulted in several changes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provided more specific language. Added some requirements for post October 2002. Eliminated two statements that were explanatory statements and not requirements. <p>General Business Requirements Changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both Availability & Reliability changed from 99.999% to 99% for year one and to 99.99% post year one. Clarified statements with more specific language. <p>Security and Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarified with more specific wording. Addition of specific language for security services to be offered post October 2002. Moved requirement for directory to post October 2002. <p>Technical Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarified statements concerning connectivity mechanisms, redundant electronics and alternate paths across the core. Added a requirement post October 2002 for redundant electronics and redundant paths. <p>Cost, Incentives and Benefit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarified and consolidated information. Eliminated statements CB-3 and CB-4 because they were statements of what Network Maryland <i>is</i> as opposed to actual requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> T-6. Add the word “implemented”. CB-1. Reword? Contradicts the Communication Committee’s message. Proposed New Category: Services offered at launch. Post “Raw Requirements” to working web site. Email members once complete. Post “Refined Requirements” to working web site. Email members once complete. Add QoS for ATM. Develop/refine the Phase II Requirements. 	<p>✓</p> <p>✓</p>
J.Blank	<p>Engineering Committee –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Results from August 14th Engineering Committee Meeting Scheduled Activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discuss issues with the Junipers at the Engineering Committee meeting on 8/28/02. Update Visio diagram with changes to 	<p>✓</p> <p>✓</p>

Reported By:	Topic / Discussion	Action	Completion
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Next Steps Phase II <p>Discussed that Manufacturers and Vendors should not be on the Engineering Committee due to possible conflict of interest. Can request technical briefings.</p>	<p>Marconi and Juniper.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop the Phase II Design. Consider "connecting" the Data Centers. 	
W.Morrow	<p><u>Cost Recovery Planning Working Group –</u></p> <p>Working Group Members: Margo Burnette, Will Morrow, Chuck Bristow, Mary Clapsaddle, Joe Scher and Gil Becker</p> <p>Objectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify net.work.Maryland service offerings Recommend price models for each service offering Recommend net.work.Maryland funding model <p>Assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> net.work.Maryland will be financially self-sustaining net.work.Maryland will win its customers based on value, i.e., service benefits must be greater than or equal to current offerings and service costs must be less than or equal to current offerings net.work.Maryland will provide its services as a menu of options net.work.Maryland will provide service level agreements net.work.Maryland budget will provide for FY2003 operations regardless of revenues <p>Recommendation #1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adopt market practice and price network services based on connection size <p>Recommendation #2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offer Basic Service package for Phase I launch, to include Intranet and Internet services <p>Additional Recommendations and Next Steps were not reviewed as the Advisory Group elected to withdraw the Cost Recovery approach in lieu of the Business Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bill Dye suggests offering "discreet" services since agencies may want to backhaul to their own ISP. Need to define "basic" package. Richard Rose suggested that the State subsidize the core network. Advisory Group members agree. Margo to put in the Budget request to subsidize the Core Network. Will Morrow to lead the effort in developing the "Business Plan" detailing the rationale to subsidize the Core Network and fully define Phase I and II. Include in the Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is subsidized and what is not. Phase I accomplishments. 	

Reported By:	Topic / Discussion	Action	Completion
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Blue Prints” ▪ Be prepared to defend “Business Plan” and previous “Plans” in front of the General Assembly. ▪ Margo will issue an open invitation to join the Cost Recovery Planning Working Group. 	
MA.Slack	<p><u>Regional Proposals</u> –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss Criteria for Regional Proposals • Requests for Usage of Fiber Being Handled Under Resource Share • Advisory Group concluded that the “regional proposals” do not need review by the Advisory Group; however, a process and acceptable use policy must be defined. Non-standard requests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Name change suggestion to “Nonstandard Connection” Proposals. ▪ Mary Ann to redistribute Guidelines to members. ▪ Need to develop process for submitting, reviewing, and approving “non-standard” requests. ▪ Suggested process includes: submitting proposal 2 weeks prior to monthly Advisory Group Meeting, request submitting entity to present at monthly Advisory Group Meeting for a Q/A session, and then the members vote to approve/deny proposal at next meeting. 	<p>✓</p> <p>✓</p>
S.Ragland	<p><u>By-Laws / Policy Committee</u> –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Latest version of bylaws/charter posted on Public Website (dated August 5th) • Committee Members: R.Forsythe, B.McGrory, P.Wallace 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Need to develop an acceptable use policy for Phase I. ▪ Need additional members. 	
R.Winsky	<p><u>Communications Committee</u> –</p> <p>Committee Members: Renee Winsky, Mary Clapsaddle, Lewis Powell, Garland Williamson, Mark Hess, Stephen McHenry, and Frank Shap</p> <p>Name and Logo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended Name: Maryland Connect • Logo: Shape of State w/ words Maryland (larger) and Connect (smaller and below “Maryland”) in semi-circle below State. The words appear to “connect” Western Maryland to the Shore and all points between. <p>Draft Communications Plan Highlights:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identification of spokesperson(s) 2. Target Markets 3. Appendix A <p>Soliciting Advisory Group’s Opinion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the expected rate of increase, month to month, of new customers on the network? 2. Considering initial constraints on bandwidth. network 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Richard Rose to verify if “Maryland Connect” is already in use. ▪ Richard Rose to draw new logo and distribute to members. 	

Reported By:	Topic / Discussion	Action	Completion
	<p>performance, down time, and customer support/service, what is the expected build-up to a stable, steady, fully operational service to customers on the network?</p> <p>3. The Communications Committee feels strongly that efforts should be made to secure at least one or more non-State agency customers (preferably a county or local government) in time for the 10/31/02 launch of the network.</p> <p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee will meet September 9 with DBM staff • Revise Communications Plan • Develop "Frequently Asked Questions" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Spokesperson(s) for network Maryland are Margo Burnette and Bill Dye. Eloise is the spokesperson in official press releases. 		
	<p><u>General Comments</u></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jeff to coordinate the Engineering Meeting for the week of August 25th. ▪ Renee to coordinate the Communications Committee & DBM Meeting scheduled for September 9th. ▪ Need to finalize the September Advisory Group Meeting in Western Maryland. ▪ Each Agency to organize and meet to prepare for "State Agencies & DBM" Meetings. ▪ DBM to coordinate the State Agencies & DBM Meetings in September. ▪ Mary Ann to coordinate the Strategic Planning Session the 1st week of October. 	<p>✓</p> <p>✓</p> <p>✓ Annapolis</p> <p>✓ Oct 4th</p>
	<p><u>Adjournment</u>- The meeting adjourned at 2:20 PM</p>		

Minutes Recorded by:
Jodey McGhee